

sheep, even though now she is 5 years old.

Even President Clinton's Bioethics Advisory Commission was clear. The commission began its discussion fully recognizing that any effort in humans to transfer somatic cell nucleus into an enucleated egg, in other words, cloning, involves the creation of an embryo. Eighty-eight percent of the American people want cloning banned, not merely because they believe it is bad science, but because they think it is morally wrong.

Let us stop playing games with words. Reject the Greenwood amendment. Support Weldon-Stupak.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a letter from the National Right to Life Committee, Inc., and a copy of a letter written by Mr. Douglas Johnson:

NATIONAL RIGHT TO LIFE
COMMITTEE, INC.,
Washington, DC, July 30, 2001.

FEDERAL PANELS AND RESEARCHERS AGREE:
HUMAN CLONING CREATES HUMAN EMBRYOS

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: At a press conference today, Congressman Greenwood and Congressman Deutsch asserted that the Greenwood-Deutsch substitute amendment to the Weldon-Stupak bill (H.R. 2505) would allow "therapeutic cloning," but they asserted that this process would not involve the creation of any human embryos.

This "argument," if it can be called that, shows a breathtaking lack of candor. For years, federal bio-ethics review bodies have acknowledged that the process of somatic cell nuclear transfer would indeed produce human embryos. For example, President Clinton's handpicked National Bioethics Advisory Commission acknowledged in its 1997 report *Cloning Human Beings*, "any effort in humans to transfer a somatic cell nucleus into an enucleated egg involves the creation of an embryo, with the apparent potential to be implanted in utero and developed to term." [emphasis added]

Earlier this month, Michael West, the head of the major biotech firm Advanced Cell Technology (ACT) of Worcester, Massachusetts, told journalists that the firm intends to start cloning "soon." As recently as the December 27, 2000 issue of the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, three members of the ACT team, including Dr. West, along with bioethicist Ronald Green of Dartmouth University and two other bioethicists, co-authored a major paper on human cloning that freely acknowledged that the method creates human embryos. They wrote, "... because therapeutic cloning requires the creation and disaggregation ex utero of blastocyst stage embryos, this technique raises complex ethical questions." [emphasis added]

The attached factsheet includes numerous such admissions from diverse researchers and public bodies. Thus, it is past time for Mr. Greenwood and Mr. Deutsch to drop their disinformation campaign and engage in an honest debate over whether human embryo farms should be allowed in this country. If you oppose the establishment of human embryo farms, vote no on the Greenwood-Deutsch substitute.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS JOHNSON,
Legislative Director.

SCIENTISTS SAY "THERAPEUTIC CLONING"
CREATES A HUMAN EMBRYO—JULY 26, 2001

President Clinton's National Bioethics Advisory Commission, in its 1997 report *Cloning Human Beings*, explicitly stated:

"The Commission began its discussions fully recognizing that any effort in humans to transfer a somatic cell nucleus into an enucleated egg involves the creation of an embryo, with the apparent potential to be implanted in utero and developed to term."

The National Institutes of Health Human Embryo Research Panel also assumed in its September 27, 1994 Final Report, that cloning results in embryos. In listing research proposals that "should not be funded for the foreseeable future" because of "serious ethical concerns," the NIH panel included cloning:

"Such research includes: . . . Studies designed to transplant embryonic or adult nuclei into an enucleated egg, including nuclear cloning, in order to duplicate a genome or to increase the number of embryos with the same genotype, with transfer."

A group of scientists, ethicists, and biotechnology executives advocating "therapeutic cloning" and use of human embryos for research—Arthur Caplan of the University of Pennsylvania, Lee Silver of Princeton University, Ronald Green of Dartmouth University, and Michael West, Robert Lanza, and Jose Cibelli of Advanced Cell Technology—confirmed in the December 27, 2000 issue of the *Journal of the American Medical Association* that a human embryo is created and destroyed through "therapeutic cloning":

"CRNT [cell replacement through nuclear transfer, another term for "therapeutic cloning"] requires the deliberate creation and disaggregation of a human embryo."

"... because therapeutic cloning requires the creation and disaggregation ex utero of blastocyst stage embryos, this technique raises complex ethical questions."

On September 7, 2000, the European Parliament adopted a resolution on human cloning. The Parliament's press release defined and commented on "therapeutic cloning":

"... 'Therapeutic cloning,' which involves the creation of human embryos purely for research purposes, poses an ethical dilemma and crosses a boundary in research norms."

Lee M. Silver, professor of molecular biology and evolutionary biology at Princeton University, argues in his 1997 book, *Remarkable Eden: Cloning and Beyond in a Brave New World*:

"Yet there is nothing synthetic about the cells used in cloning. . . . The newly created embryo can only develop inside the womb of a woman in the same way that all embryos and fetuses develop. Cloned children will be full-fledged human beings, indistinguishable in biological terms from all other members of the species."

The President and CEO of the biotechnology firm that recently announced its intentions to clone human embryos for research purposes, Michael D. West, Ph.D. of Advanced Cell Technology, testified before a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on December 2, 1998:

"In this . . . procedure, body cells from a patient would be fused with an egg cell that has had its nucleus (including the nuclear DNA) removed. This would theoretically allow the production of a blastocyst-staged embryo genetically identical to the patient . . ."

Dr. Ian Wilmut of PPL Technologies, leader of the team that cloned Dolly the sheep, describes in the Spring 1998 issue of *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics* how embryos are used in the process now referred to as "therapeutic cloning":

"One potential use for this technique would be to take cells—skin cells, for example—from a human patient who had a genetic disease. . . . You take this and get them

back to the beginning of their life by nuclear transfer into an oocyte to produce a new embryo. From that new embryo, you would be able to obtain relatively simple, undifferentiated cells, which would retain the ability to colonize the tissues of the patient."

As documented in the *American Medical News*, February 23, 1998, University of Colorado human embryologist Jonathan Van Blerkom expressed disbelief that some deny that human cloning produces an embryo, commenting: "If it's not an embryo, what is it?"

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the House the following article written by Mr. Douglas Johnson of the National Right to Life Committee.

THE AMAZING VANISHING EMBRYO TRICK

It was revealed last week that Advanced Cell Technology (ACT) of Worcester, Massachusetts, a prominent privately owned biotechnology firm, has a plan to mass-produce human embryos. The firm also has a plan to render those same embryos nonexistent.

ACT is attempting to develop a technique to produce "cloned human entities," who would then be killed in order to harvest their stem cells, as first reported by Washington Post science writer Rick Weiss (July 13).

As Associated Press biotechnology writer Paul Elias explained in a July 13 report, "Many scientists consider the [anticipated] results of Advanced Cell's technique to be human embryos, since theoretically, they could be implanted into a womb and grown into a fetus. [ACT chief executive Michael] West himself has used the term 'embryo.'"

But it looks like West and his colleagues will not be saying "embryo" in the future. ACT's executives are smart people who anticipated that many outsiders would see their embryo-farm project as an ethical nightmare. So ACT assembled a special task force of scientists and "ethicists" to develop linguistic stealth devices, with which they hope to slip under the public's moral radar.

As Weiss reported it, "Before starting, the company created an independent ethics board with nationally recognized scientists and ethicists. . . . The group has debated at length whether there needs to be a new term developed for the embryo-like entity created by cloning. Some believe that since it is not produced by fertilization and is not going to be allowed to develop into a fetus, it would be useful to call the cells something less inflammatory than an embryo."

"Embryo" is merely a technical term for a human being at the earliest stages of development. Until now, even the most rabid defenders of abortion on demand had not objected to the term "embryo" as being "inflammatory." But apparently ACT's experts have concluded that before the corporation actually begins to mass-produce human embryos in order to kill them, it would be prudent to erect a shield of biobabble euphemisms.

Thus, "These are not embryos," the chair of the ACT ethics advisory board, Dartmouth University religion professor Ronald Green, told the AP. "They are not the result of fertilization and there is no intent to implant these in women and grow them."

Further details on the ACT linguistic-engineering project were provided in an essay by Weiss in the July 15 *Washington Post*. It disclosed that one member of the ethics panel, Harvard professor Ann Kieffling, favors dubbing the cloned embryo as an "ovasome," which is a blending of words for "egg" and "body." But Michael West currently likes "nuclear transfer-derived blastocyst."

Green revealed his own favorite in the *New York Times* for July 13. "I'm tending personally to steer toward the term 'activated egg,'" he told reporter Sheryl Gay Stolberg.